

Osamu SUZUKI, S.N. 10/633,976
Page 8

Dkt. 2271/70770

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 22 2007

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 21, 2007.

Claims 1-13 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 1-13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 14-26 have been added. Accordingly, claims 14-26 are now pending, with claims 14, 19 and 22 being in independent form.

Claims 10 and 11 were objected to as having informalities.

By this Amendment, claims 10 and 11 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly the objection is now moot.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,922,255 to Tomida.

By this Amendment, claims 1-13 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly the rejection is now moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 14, 19 and 22 are patentable over the cited art, for at least the following reasons.

Tomida fails to teach or suggest a network facsimile apparatus comprising (a) code determination part configured to determine whether a *specific user code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the network facsimile apparatus*, has been specified, (b) subject name registration part configured to register for each of a plurality of registered user codes, corresponding one or more *subject names associated with the registered user code*, and (c) subject name specifying part configured to *automatically specify one of the subject names registered for the specific user code of the current operator and registered in the subject name registration part, as the transmission*

Osamu SUZUKI, S.N. 10/633,976
Page 9

Dkt. 2271/70770

subject name of the mail data to be transmitted (each of independent claims 14 and 22 of the present application).

In connection with claim 5 as originally filed, the Office Action states that the one-touch keys in the system proposed by Tomida is analogous to an identification code.

However, the one-touch keys in the system proposed by Tomida is not specific to the current operator and does not differentiate said current operator from other operators of the network facsimile apparatus.

Accordingly, applicant submits that independent claims 14 and 22, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentable over the cited art.

Tomida also fails to teach or suggest a network facsimile apparatus comprising (a) code determination part configured to determine whether a *specific user code, specific to a current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the network facsimile apparatus*, has been specified, (b) address registration determination part configured to determine whether *a mail address is registered for the specific user code of the current operator*, if said code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified; and (c) subject name specifying part configured to *automatically specify another subject name, based on the mail address registered for the specific user code, as the transmission subject name* of the mail data to be transmitted, if said code determination part determines that the specific user code of the current operator has been specified and said address registration determination part determines that the mail address is registered for the specific user code (independent claims 19 of the present application).

In addition to the fact that Tomida does not teach or suggest use of a user code specific to

Osamu SUZUKI, S.N. 10/633,976
Page 10

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Dkt. 2271/70770

AUG 22 2007

the current operator and differentiating said current operator from other operators of the network facsimile apparatus, Tomida also fails to teach or suggest forming a subject name based on a registered mail address.

Contrary to the implication in the Office Action, one-touch keys assigned to registered mail addresses are not associated with one-touch keys associated with registered titles. That is, there is no connection between mail addresses and titles in the system proposed by Tomida.

Moreover, Tomida says nothing about generating a title based on a registered mail address.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 19 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over the cited art.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Teng, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400